



# VU Research Portal

## Good government and providential delivery. Representations of the 1672 and 1688/89 Orangist revolutions in Dutch sermons

Wieldraaijer, M.H.

**published in**  
Dutch Crossing  
2010

**DOI (link to publisher)**  
[10.1179/030965610X12634710163141](https://doi.org/10.1179/030965610X12634710163141)

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

### **citation for published version (APA)**

Wieldraaijer, M. H. (2010). Good government and providential delivery. Representations of the 1672 and 1688/89 Orangist revolutions in Dutch sermons. *Dutch Crossing*, 34(1), 42-58.  
<https://doi.org/10.1179/030965610X12634710163141>

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**E-mail address:**  
[vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl](mailto:vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl)

# Good Government and Providential Delivery: Legitimations of the 1672 and 1688/89 Orangist Revolutions in Dutch Sermons

MATTHIJS WIELDRAAIJER

*VU University Amsterdam, NL*

This article focuses on the justifications of the Orangist revolutions of 1672 and 1688/89 in Dutch sermons. It argues that the representations of these revolutions were very similar. Both providential discourse and the notion of good government were significant themes in the accounts of the changes of government that occurred in the Dutch Republic and England. William III of Orange was seen as a good ruler: a shepherd to his flock, who guided them, preserved them, and was even prepared to give his life for his people. He defended and maintained the laws, liberties, and religion of two Protestant nations and was therefore considered a righteous king and a capable stadholder. In the eyes of Dutch clergymen he was clearly a Protestant hero: an instrument in God's hands whose purpose of being born was to rescue the Dutch and English from popery and slavery. As will be shown, in the descriptions of the 1672 and 1688/89 revolution Orange, charisma was linked with William's endeavours and virtues. His rule reminded Dutch ministers of his great-grandfather, William I, who, according to them, also defended the religion and freedom of an oppressed nation, and in the end gave his life for his people.

**KEYWORDS** William III of Orange, Glorious Revolution, Political sermons, Legitimations of revolutions, Dutch Reformed Church

## Introduction

When Petrus van Balen, Amalia van Solms's court chaplain, preached his sermon 'On the Office of the Stadholder', William III of Orange had already been Stadholder for six months. The sermon was preached at Amalia's court in The Hague and was dedicated to the recently elected Stadholder William III, Amalia's grandson. It was an

example of Orangist propaganda par excellence. July 1672 saw the elevation of William III to the stadholderate. In February 1673, Petrus van Balen recalled the facts his hearers knew very well. The unthinkable had happened. The French had invaded the Dutch Republic by ‘breaking through its doors, polluting its halls, tearing down its rooms and breaking its walls’.<sup>1</sup> The overthrow of the Dutch Republic would have been imminent had not the Prince of Orange been appointed Stadholder. This, according to Van Balen, could only have been the work of the Almighty God. It was the Lord who had elevated the Prince of Orange. William, like King David in the Old Testament, was now fighting the wars of the Lord and He had broken his enemies before him.<sup>2</sup>

Providential discourse played a pivotal role in the self-understanding of the Dutch Republic as a political community. In the sermon preached on the occasion of the funeral of William I in 1584, for example, the preacher declared that the Prince of Orange was the instrument of God through whom the Almighty had done many great things for the Dutch Republic.<sup>3</sup> But there is another argument, which the Dutch ministers presented in their published sermons to legitimize William’s elevation in 1672 and the subsequent downfall of the republican regents that same year. William, according to them, was the saviour of the country. He was represented as the messianic hero who defended the public good: the Reformed religion and the republican freedom. He was, in short, seen as a good ruler.

The notion of good government was abundant in the pamphlet literature of 1672.<sup>4</sup> As will be shown, both providential delivery and good government were also the main themes in the representations of the revolution of 1688. The descriptions of the two revolutions and the sudden changes in government had much in common.<sup>5</sup> Reformed clergymen used similar arguments to defend William’s elevation in 1672 and 1689. At the heart of the representations of William’s government lay questions such as: what exactly were the rights and liberties of people and who had the right to defend them? Who had the right to resist the monarch and for what reasons? This article addresses these and other questions, by analysing the legitimations of William’s government in Dutch Reformed sermons. These legitimations give an excellent insight into the early modern confessional understanding of good government.

### **William’s good government: ‘the Year of Disaster’**

One way the revolutions in which William was involved were justified was to declare that he was a good ruler. This becomes clear when we look at the descriptions of the Orangist revolution of 1672, the year the Dutch call *Het Rampjaar*, the Year of Disaster, when the Dutch Republic was attacked by England, France, and the bishops of Münster and Cologne. The French army had marched into the heart of the Republic, capturing the cities of Nijmegen and Utrecht. Due to the French invasion, a great panic broke out in the provinces of Holland and Zeeland which eventually led to the collapse of the regime of Holland’s leading politician, Johan de Witt. In the so-called stadholderless period, which lasted from 1650 to 1672, William III had been

systematically kept out of office by De Witt and the mighty regents of Holland. But now, in 1672, facing the threat of the French army, he was appointed Stadholder by the acclamation of the common people. For it was the people who made William Stadholder and changed the structure of power.<sup>6</sup>

It is well known that the republican, states-orientated party, of which De Witt was a member, held the opinion that the 'true freedom' of the Dutch Republic was threatened by the monarchical aspirations of the House of Orange.<sup>7</sup> Dutch Reformed clergymen in their sermons, on the other hand, represented William of Orange as the defender and preserver of liberty. Clearly there were competing claims to the key concept of liberty, especially in times of crisis. The Williamite propaganda of 1672 is full of examples celebrating the Prince of Orange as the saviour of the country. In Dutch sermons, William was praised particularly for his preservation of the Dutch liberties and the Reformed religion. Due to his military achievements he had saved the Dutch people from Roman Catholicism and French slavery. Van Bylert, for example, declared that William had done great things for 'the common weal, for the Evangelical people, yes for the whole of Europe with the help of God'. He had rescued the 'bodies and souls' of the Dutch by saving them from 'French and Roman tyranny'.<sup>8</sup> Van Bylert equated the protection of the Reformed religion and the republican freedom with the interest of all. William was prepared to give his life for the salvation of his people and was eager to sacrifice himself for the common good if necessary.<sup>9</sup> He therefore gave the Prince of Orange epithets such as: 'Father of both Church and State', 'Shepherd', 'Protector', and 'Leader'.<sup>10</sup> The art of government according to Van Bylert consisted of the protection and maintenance of the two pillars of the state: religion and freedom. Without these foundations the state would collapse and there would be no public interest to uphold any longer. This idiom expressed the close relationship between Church and State in the confessional era.<sup>11</sup> As is well known, the Dutch Reformed Church was a kind of established Church. It upheld a complex network of formal and informal ties with the political administration; ties that were sanctioned in constitutional documents like the Union of Utrecht (1579). The maintenance of the Reformed religion was one of the fundamental principles of the Dutch Republic, and office holders like the stadholder had to swear an oath on the maintenance and protection of the true Reformed religion.<sup>12</sup>

Vechovius therefore, in the same vein as Van Bylert, maintained that William 'really loved his people and did anything to safeguard and protect the Religion with so much duty and attention as has never been seen before'. He was prepared to give his life for his country, its freedom and its religion.<sup>13</sup> The above mentioned Van Balen compared William's election to the stadholderate with the appointment of the shepherd David as King of Israel. God had taken William 'from the sheep to be a leader of my people'.<sup>14</sup> William would, just like Israel's famous king, uphold the house of God and he would not rest before the occupied provinces were recaptured, Van Balen wrote.<sup>15</sup> The preacher Costerus asserted that — regarding these times and states — the election of the Prince of Orange was of great importance and that if he died, it would create such confusion that the common good would suffer vehemently.<sup>16</sup>

De La Faye was of the opinion that William had combated the 'Egyptians and other foes of God's Church' and he had therefore exposed himself to 'many Dangers'.<sup>17</sup> Another preacher, Van Assendelft, was of the opinion that William had risked his life against the enemies of the state 'in order to protect our Religion and Freedom', just as the Old Testament patriarch Jacob had risked his life 'for his sheep against the threatening wild beasts'. The Prince of Orange's concerns for his country and Church were of the same order as Jacob's care for his sheep: 'By serving others, he consumed himself'.<sup>18</sup>

The message was clear: William was the saviour of the Dutch who had safeguarded them from Roman Catholicism and French absolutism and who did not seek his own glory. On the contrary, he had risked his own life for his flock and he always followed the maxims of the public good. This fatherly image made it possible for the Dutch to identify themselves with a political system in which their interests were safeguarded by the Prince of Orange. Although Reformed clergymen stated that the prince of Orange was a good ruler and thereby justified his sudden election in 1672, they certainly did not uphold the opinion that the republican regents, who had kept William out of office, had been bad rulers. The minister Moonen clearly was an outsider when he stated that William had been excluded from office for the sake of freedom. But God revealed his will through the 'voice of the people' and showed that 'Freedom is best defended by moderate captains'.<sup>19</sup> But when it came to the beloved Dutch freedom the attack was mainly aimed at Louis XIV, not at Holland's regents. Louis was seen as a tyrant who sought to ruin the Dutch Republic by depriving it of its 'Religion/Freedom and everything'.<sup>20</sup> Clergymen who did not see the wars against Louis XIV as wars of religion, were few and far between. David Onnekink, arguably incorrectly, maintains that: 'Calvinist ministers all understood these conflicts in a spiritual way, they did not necessarily see them as wars of religion'.<sup>21</sup> Protestant preachers interpreted the Franco-Dutch war as a defensive war fought for the sake of the reformed religion and the republican freedom. The question of what role religion played in the accounts of the revolutions of 1672 and 1688 will be treated more extensively later on. For now, it suffices to say that the idea that the state waged a defensive war with the aim of defending its own religion, was a recurring one among Dutch divines.<sup>22</sup> The greatest threat to the common good, they maintained, was therefore not the self-interest of the arrogant republican regents who wished to govern without a stadholder, but the 'Most Christian destroyer of country and church', Louis XIV, who had to be halted.<sup>23</sup> William clearly became the embodiment of the fundamental values of the Dutch Republic: its religion and freedom, just as his great enemy, the French King Louis XIV, was the embodiment of the negation of these values, namely arbitrary government, slavery and popery, persecution, and absolutism.

### **William's good government: the revolution of 1688/89**

For English clergymen, especially for Tories, two major politico-theological problems had come to the fore, initially when James II & VII had pursued his policy of

toleration, and subsequently, when William had invaded England in 1688 and ascended the throne in 1689. Tories adhered to the doctrine of passive obedience and the maxim that the king could do no wrong. They thought that the king, God's anointed, should never be resisted. They legitimized, therefore, their non-compliance with James's religious politics with an appeal to the country's laws. These should be upheld, even in face of a sovereign who sought to violate them.<sup>24</sup> When William had taken up arms against his uncle and father-in-law James II & VII and landed with his great armada of nearly 500 vessels at Devon, many Englishmen had explicitly resisted the English king. One of them was the Earl of Danby, who had previously promoted the English sovereign as a divinely appointed, absolute monarch. Although he still maintained that all powers were ordained by God and thus should not be resisted (Romans 13), he justified his resistance by declaring that governments had 'God's warrant to proceed according to the Frame of the Government, to the End of Government, which is the publick Good'. But, he pursued, 'if the Ruler proceed neither according to the frame of the Government, nor to the End, but against it, such Process cannot be the Ordinance of God'.<sup>25</sup>

It is well known that the Tories were inclined to uphold the sanctity of hereditary kingship. The transfer of the crown from James to William and Mary in 1689 also raised other politico-theological difficulties. Could God's anointed be deposed? Did Parliament have the right to choose its own king at will? The Convention summoned by William, who legally had no rights whatsoever to do so, debated these questions in January 1689. In the end, after a hot debate, the Convention determined that James was not deposed but had abdicated, thereby leaving the throne vacant and in need of being filled. His abdication followed from his violation of England's fundamental laws and in doing so he had broken the original contract between the King and his people. He also had withdrawn himself from government by his flight to France without providing any government in his absence. From these considerations the Convention deduced that James had 'unkinged' himself.<sup>26</sup>

Naturally, Dutch Reformed ministers were of the opinion that all power was ordained by God and thus should not be resisted. Without exception, all seventeenth- and eighteenth-century interpreters of the Heidelberg Catechism — one of the so-called 'Formularies of Unity' of the Dutch Reformed Church — maintained this Pauline maxim.<sup>27</sup> How then did they intellectually come to terms with William's invasion of a foreign country and his coronation as King of England while the former king was still alive? One of the lines of argument the preachers followed could be reduced to this statement: James II was a bad king, whereas William III was a good one. In a sermon preached on the occasion of William's departing in 1688, Costerus had digressed from the theme of good government. Good government, he stated, was 'to rule wisely / to do justice between Man and his neighbour / to punish the wicked / protect and reward the good / and above all to heed the common good'.<sup>28</sup> Orange was such a good ruler, according to Costerus. William was a virtuous king who did not follow his own interests. James II & VII, on the contrary, had been seduced by wicked councillors. 'He has broken laws and the Pretended Prince of Wales is not of

the queen', claims Costerus, paraphrasing the *Declaration of Reasons*.<sup>29</sup> Van Zelst wrote that James, in line with 'the doctrine of tyranny', tried to 'institute his unrestrained will as a directive of Governance by annulling the Test Act and penal laws, which are the nerves of the Realm'.<sup>30</sup> James was said to be another 'Haman whose cruel plans were obstructed by the righteous Mordechai and Hester'.<sup>31</sup> Another preacher stated that the English king, 'the dreadful James', had secured his throne with 'the blood of the duke of Monmouth and the earl of Argyll', referring to the Monmouth rebellion and the Scottish rising of 1685. His main objectives were to obtain 'arbitrary Rule and Sovereign power alongside the persecution of the English church and introduction of the Roman Religion'.<sup>32</sup> Van Eybergen claimed that England was sighing under the weight of 'Arbitrary power'; 'Under appearance of Freedom of Conscience, Papery was introduced'; 'London swarmed with Jesuits / Monks and Papists'. Moreover, James was determined to put 'an abhorrent Bastard' on the throne. 'Slavery was affirmed now / and idolatry secured.'<sup>33</sup> Even ministers who preached a funeral sermon on the occasion of the death of Mary Stuart declared that 'Her father, the king, had given over his power to the Beast and tried to put superstition on the throne'.<sup>34</sup>

William, on the other hand, was depicted as a good king since he, unlike his father-in-law, wished to rule according to England's liberties and laws without pursuing his own interests. But in the first place, William was lauded as the saviour of the English people. He was described as the selfless deliverer whose only purpose in coming to England had been to restore the laws, liberties, and religion of the nation. The Reformed clergymen were absolutely convinced that William was the instrument in God's hand to deliver the English people from popery and slavery, and to preserve the laws, religion, and liberties of both nations. Vollenhove, in similar vein, wrote that William was the 'deliverer of tyranny and of Popery'.<sup>35</sup> Another preacher claimed that William was another Caesar — *veni, vidi, vici*. He restored England's 'laws, Religion and freedom'.<sup>36</sup> Velingius celebrated William's salvation of the English from 'Popery and Arbitrary Power',<sup>37</sup> and Le Roy stated that William had brought 'Three large, waddling Monarchies' in a state of firmness and had consoled 'a sighing Nation whose unjust King sought to remove its Laws and Liberties' by restoring its foundations.<sup>38</sup> According to Van Eybergen, William and Mary deserved the crown as they would reign in line with the country's laws and in the future protect it from 'Popery and slavery'.<sup>39</sup> In his funeral sermon, Goltzius maintained that William had saved the English and had subsequently 'ruled wisely and prudently to the contentment of his subjects'.<sup>40</sup> Van Bylert, too, claimed that William had been consumed with working very hard, both in England and in the United Provinces.<sup>41</sup> Wilhelmius even wrote that the Prince of Orange had advocated English liberties to his own disadvantage.<sup>42</sup>

William's propaganda campaign clearly was a great success. The political languages he exploited in this campaign, in order to convince the English people and the Dutch regents that England had to be liberated by the Dutch Stadholder from the tyrannical government of James II & VII,<sup>43</sup> were almost identical to the descriptions the



Reformed ministers gave of the events surrounding the revolution of 1688/89. Reformed clergymen even pushed the argument one step further by attacking James personally. In the *Declaration of Reasons* (1688) William and his propagandists had accused James's councillors, not the King himself. Dutch preachers, however, represented the English King as a bad ruler, a wicked prince, sometimes even explicitly as Satan's henchman, who sought to ruin the English people and the Church of England. William, however, was depicted as a good king, who had saved the English, restored its constitution, and ruled wisely, righteously and mildly, according to the maxims of the public good. According to the Reformed clergymen, James had tried to derive his power from his own sovereignty, which had resulted in arbitrary government and despotic rule, while William sought to rule in line with the wishes of the English people as expressed by their laws, freedoms, and religion. According to the Dutch Reformed preachers, he had not taken up arms against God's anointed. James had sought to destroy England's liberties and religion, govern arbitrarily as an absolutist monarch, and, by doing so, had proven himself unworthy to be an English king any longer. Le Roy, for instance, stated that James had proved himself unworthy to be king 'by ruling unjustly'. He had 'resigned his reign treacherously' by 'ignominiously leaving the country'.<sup>44</sup> Moreover, he had lost God's favour, as once Israel's King Saul had lost God's favour. William's father-in-law, Bosch, wrote that he 'had been repudiated by God in his righteous judgement'.<sup>45</sup> The minister Tiele, in the same vein, wrote that William, like David, had been anointed King while his father-in-law was still alive. James was of course compared to Saul in that the English King had made himself unworthy to rule any longer by 'suspending the Test and Penal Laws, polluting Religion, despising the authority of Parliament and by introducing popery'.<sup>46</sup> Clearly, the Dutch clergymen did not uphold the doctrine of passive obedience. Although they did not explicitly refer to resistance theories, constitutional thought was present almost everywhere. The revolution of 1688/89 reminded the Dutch of their own political system and of their own history of resistance.<sup>47</sup> The Dutch ministers declared that William's invasion was righteous because he had to undo James's disastrous, ungodly, and wicked policies. He had to save the liberties and religion of England. James had intended to destroy the constitution of the country and by doing so became a tyrant. He had not only been unwilling to rule the country according to its laws, liberties, and religion, but had turned himself against the principles of government. Therefore, William had to rescue the country.

It is well known that the Dutch Reformed resistance theory allowed certain inferior magistrates the right to resist tyrants.<sup>48</sup> Dutch Calvinists had embraced constitutional thought since the Dutch Revolt of the sixteenth-century. The 'Act of Abjuration' (1581), which could be considered as the States General's formal declaration of independence of the Dutch Low Countries, stated that if the prince broke the contracts and turned himself against the common good, he became a tyrant and therefore legally forfeited his sovereignty. As a consequence, the subjects had the right to choose another sovereign.<sup>49</sup> William's *Declaration*, drafted by Holland's Grand Pensionary



Fagel and translated by Burnet,<sup>50</sup> resembled the Act of Abjuration in that it made a plea for limited government and presented a long list of grievances in which it accused the sovereign of misruling the country. Most preachers, in line with both William's *Declaration* and Dutch republicanism, promoted limited government and agreed that James had maltreated his subjects. Some preachers, though not all, drew from this constitutionalism the conclusion that — not unlike the Dutch situation — Parliament was sovereign and the English monarchy an elective one. Le Roy, for instance, in his sermon preached on the occasion of the unsuccessful attempt to assassinate the King in 1696, stated that James, by ruling as a tyrant and fleeing the country, had forfeited his sovereignty. Without a king, Parliament was therefore in its right to choose a new one, which they had done.<sup>51</sup> Velingius, too, asserted that Parliament held sovereignty and represented the country's subjects. Parliament had therefore legitimately chosen William as their king, while taking into account both the hereditary succession and the elective character of English monarchy.<sup>52</sup> According to the minister Ubink, William and Mary had been chosen lawfully as King and Queen, after James had left the throne.<sup>53</sup> Other clergymen approached the problem more pragmatically and declared that no one was worthier to ascend the throne than William of Orange, regarding the efforts he had made to rescue the English from popery and slavery.<sup>54</sup> William was seen as the saviour of the English Church and nation, who was willing to rule the country in line with its constitution and therefore deserved the crown. The legitimacy of his kingship was unquestioned.

### Providential delivery and Orange charisma

Tony Claydon has pointed our attention to a 'biblically based discourse which presented William as a providential ruler who had a divine commission to protect the protestant church in England, and to return the nation to its pristine faith, piety, and virtue'.<sup>55</sup> Steven Pincus, on the other hand, has argued that most of William's supporters used a language based on the secular threat of Louis XIV's aspiration to dominate Western Europe. He explicitly rejected Claydon's characterization of Williamite propaganda as godly rhetoric.<sup>56</sup> In his reaction to this criticism, Claydon admitted that Williamite propaganda was not as monolithically 'godly' as he had claimed in his *William III and the Godly Revolution*. The secular ambitions of Louis XIV were indeed seen as a major threat to England's and Europe's liberties and safety. Both Protestant providentialism and the language of universal monarchy, according to Claydon, 'existed amongst several understandings and justifications of William's war, in a multi-faceted rhetorical field'.<sup>57</sup> Whereas Claydon has accepted a less strong position regarding providential discourse, Pincus on the other hand, in his recent book *1688: The first Modern Revolution*, has tried to downplay the role of religious arguments altogether. He comes to the conclusion that 'the early Protestant worldview ... was becoming increasingly untenable'. 'Most, even most clerics, in England', Pincus continues, 'had already moved away from confessional politics and beyond the early Protestant worldview'.<sup>58</sup> It will be clear that Pincus adheres to a secularization

theory of sorts, equating the secular justifications of William's rule with modernity, and religious arguments with backwardness and conservativeness.<sup>59</sup>

I am inclined to follow Claydon's analysis of Williamite propaganda, as it is consistent with my analysis of the Dutch sermons. Pincus's claim that James's opponents looked to the Dutch Republic for inspiration in the political, economic, and religious sphere is somewhat confusing.<sup>60</sup> Regarding the religious sphere, Van Eijnatten has argued convincingly that the Dutch Republic was not an experiment in modern statehood, 'a semi-democratic, tolerant anomaly that foreshadowed certain liberal values'. The Dutch Republic was a confessional state with a public Church. State policies were not guided by the notion that 'diversity was unavoidable, but by the conviction that concord was necessary'.<sup>61</sup> Only after 1750, were Protestant dissenters seen as moral citizens who could contribute positively to society.<sup>62</sup> Moreover, anti-Catholic sentiment remained strong, even in the age of the Enlightenment.<sup>63</sup> The integration of Dutch Catholics into society between 1770 and 1790 was very limited.<sup>64</sup> Fagel's letter — the pamphlet which is known as the letter from Grand Pensionary Fagel to Dr Stewart, a Scottish dissenter — made the position of the Dutch authorities concerning toleration very clear. It declared that 'no Christian ought to be persecuted for his Conscience, or be ill used because he differs from the public and established Religion'. The letter continued by stating that although Roman Catholics 'enjoy a full Liberty of Conscience' in the Dutch Republic, it would be a misunderstanding to claim that 'Roman Catholicks in these Provinces are not shut out from Employments and places of Trust'. 'For our Laws are express, excluding them by name from all share in the Government, and from all Employments either of the Policy or Justice of our Countrey.' These laws were necessary to protect the Protestants because Catholics did not recognize the freedom of others.<sup>65</sup> In other words, to maintain and protect the Protestant religion was not the same as persecuting Roman Catholics or forcing them to convert. This was also the opinion of the Dutch Reformed ministers. Vechovius, for example, in his sermon stated that 'conscience can not and may not be forced by any one, for faith is a gift of God'. Having said that, it was also true that 'the high Authorities have the duty to ... avert all idolatries and errors and preserve pure Religion'.<sup>66</sup> Ubink, too, wrote that the 'expansion of Jesus' Kingdom, was of utmost importance to him'. William, however, 'used only Evangelical means, knowing well, that the use of force is ineffective'.<sup>67</sup>

Clearly, Reformed ministers were of the opinion that William was a good prince, even taking into account their own confessional standards.<sup>68</sup> He did not persecute religious dissenters, but he certainly defended, preserved, and maintained the Reformed religion in both the Dutch Republic and England. According to them, William was a providentially led hero, whose purpose of being born was to protect the Reformed religion and the freedom of Europe against the aggressive, belligerent Louis XIV.<sup>69</sup> This providential discourse, in which members of the Orange family were seen as saviours of the nation and the Church, was very common among Dutch divines, even in the eighteenth century.<sup>70</sup> Providential discourse in seventeenth-century sermons was inextricably intertwined with memories of the Dutch Revolt and the role William

I had played in the struggle against Catholic Spain. The Revolt had shaped the perception of the Dutch Republic as a political community and the Reformed Church as a religious one. The conflict with external enemies who sought to demolish the very foundations of the United Provinces laid during the Revolt — its liberties and its religion — remained the focus of Dutch memorial culture.

It should come as no surprise that William regarded himself as God's instrument, chosen by Him to halt Louis XIV. The narrative of the Oranges as providential deliverers had been part of William's own education. The Dutch Reformed minister Cornelis Trigland had played an important part in William's instruction during his youth. Trigland had been appointed as William's educator in 1656 in order to 'instruct him in the fear of God and the true Christian Reformed religion'.<sup>71</sup> Trigland's nephew Jacobus Trigland — who was Professor of Theology at the University of Leiden — remembered a story his uncle told him about the young prince. He once had found him in his bedroom at night praying that he would be a nursing father and a pillar of the Church.<sup>72</sup> The content of Trigland's lessons can be deduced from his advisory tract: *Idea, Sive Imago Principis Christiani* (1666).<sup>73</sup> In his *Dedicatio*, Trigland wrote that William had inherited the virtues of his ancestors, who had been examples of virtue and courage by the grace of God. He should always keep them in mind so that he could follow their virtues. For he was to succeed them and shared their blood, and should therefore practise their virtues.<sup>74</sup> Trigland clearly was an Orangist. The letter he wrote to his former pupil in the revolutionary year 1672 when William was elected Stadholder was revealing in that respect. The minister claimed that his election had been a 'wonderful and sudden change by God Almighty' and that he should maintain the Reformed religion and, from now on, select only magistrates who were of that creed.<sup>75</sup> It was the same confessional axiom as the one he had strongly advised his pupil to follow in his advisory tract, in which he recommended the young prince to fear God, to support the Reformed Church, and to appoint only magistrates who professed the Reformed religion. He should, however, never persecute Catholics and Protestant dissenters who profess their religion in private, because Christ himself had tolerated hypocrites.<sup>76</sup>

Many sermons conveyed the same message. William was only six years old when Scutter, in a sermon solemnly held on the occasion of his entry in the county of Buren, told him that his ancestors, the princes of Orange, by their bravery, had driven the Spaniards out of the country and thus warranted the freedom of the United Provinces during the Dutch Revolt. Furthermore, the young Prince of Orange was told that his great-grandfather, William I, had laid 'the first stone of our State and Freedom'. God had used him as his instrument in order to defeat the enemies of the Dutch Israel and plant his vineyard there.<sup>77</sup> The Franco-Dutch war and the revolution of 1688/89 were seen in the same light. Louis XIV, according to Van Til, had sought to subjugate the Dutch and institute a monarchy. William III, however, had been raised by God to halt the 'insatiable lust for power of that Haughty', the French king. God's mercy, Van Til continued, was extended in that the prince saved 'the British people from Popery and Slavery, and confirmed the foundations of its government, alongside the Protestant entity'.<sup>78</sup> Orange's successful military

operations in both 1672 and 1688 were seen as a sign that God had chosen the Prince as an instrument to defend the Protestant religion and to halt slavery, popery, persecution, and arbitrary rule. God's will was evident in both Orangist revolutions. Preachers stated that the changes of government in both nations had come about as a result of God's Providence. In 1672, God had used an Orange to preserve the 'Dutch Israel' and to safeguard the Dutch from despotic power, as he had done before, during the Dutch Revolt against Spain. Van Toll, for instance, wrote: 'Our Delivery in the Year seventy-two should be seen as the outcome of God's Omnipotence and Love for us.'<sup>79</sup> According to Doesburg, William was 'a real Moses born in worrisome times to be a Saviour to the People of the Lord'.<sup>80</sup> The Lord, the minister Moonen maintained, had made 'our Joshua' victorious since he, in 1673, recaptured Naarden, defeating the 'French Philistines'. For 'the hand of the Lord turned itself against these Philistines'.<sup>81</sup> De la Faye claimed that 'William I had bravely resisted the Spanish cruelties and his Sons and Successors had broken the Power of that outrageous Lust for Power by their Wisdom and Fortitude.' William III, De la Faye continues, 'had been an eminent imitator of his Ancestor's virtues and had proven to be an implacable enemy of the French Lust for Power and their iniquities'.<sup>82</sup>

Regarding the revolution of 1688/89, the Dutch Reformed minister Vechovius maintained that the 'illustrious passage, of our Stadhouder, to England, in order to miraculously save the nation from Popery, and Slavery, had been blessed and directed by God'.<sup>83</sup> Vollenhove was of the opinion that William had been a blessed instrument in God's hands: 'in the year 1688, England / and we with England / yea innumerable nations and peoples / had been saved, besides God, by William's hand'. 'Whose hand had been used by Divine Providence for the salvation of his people in our days?', Vollenhove asked rhetorically. 'Through the sword of the Lord and the blessed weapons of our Gideon, King William has restored the true Religion of a faithful nation and saved them from popery and slavery,' Artopé asserted.<sup>84</sup> Another preacher, Goltzius, stated that God had used William as 'an important instrument in his hand; mainly / to save England from its great danger / and restore its freedom / and secure its Religion and hereditary Kingship'.<sup>85</sup> The above mentioned Moonen declared that William was born 'just like his ancestors' to save 'suppressed nations from popery and slavery'.<sup>86</sup> Ubink also linked England's delivery with Providence and the charisma of the Orange family. 'Divine Providence', he wrote, 'was willing to choose the last of the Orange-tree to perform a wonderwork that will remain in eternal reminiscence, not unlike that of his Great-grandfather, I mean WILLIAM I, Deliverer of the Spanish Yoke.'<sup>87</sup>

The providential discourse in which William I, with the help of God, was seen as the founder of the Dutch Republic was not exclusively Orangist. For example, Johan de Witt, the Grand Pensionary of Holland, had argued, in his justification of the 'Act of Exclusion', that the foundations of the Republic had been laid not only by the provinces of Holland and Zeeland but also by 'the wonderful government and merciful direction of his Divine Majesty'. More surprisingly, De Witt, in his treatise in which he tried to justify the exclusion of William III from public office, also



FIGURE 1 Pieter Nason, *Four generations princes of Orange* — William I, Maurice, Frederick Henry, William II and William III, c. 1660–62. William III is depicted on the far right of the painting.

*By permission of the Rijksmuseum Amsterdam.*

credited William I of Orange, the *pater patriae*, for having laid the foundations of the Republic's freedom.<sup>88</sup> Paradoxically enough, William I was here depicted as the personification and protector of a collective system of values — in this case Dutch freedom — by the most influential member of the so-called states party, which upheld the doctrine of 'true freedom', i.e. governance without a stadholder. Although De Witt had tried to downplay the achievements of William's successors and had stressed



the significance of the Dutch regents, in the collective memory of the Dutch, William I was almost sacrosanct. According to Olaf Mörke, William's contribution to the foundation of the Dutch Republic was never questioned fundamentally.<sup>89</sup> Therefore, to defend William III's rule, preachers could easily employ a rhetoric of providentialism in which the charisma of William I of Orange and references to the Dutch Revolt played an important constitutive part.

## Conclusion

To legitimize the Orangist revolutions of 1672 and 1688/89, the Reformed clergymen employed a political as well as a religious rhetoric. William III was regarded as 'the equator of Europe, the band of Allies . . . Europe's greatest Saviour'.<sup>90</sup> But he was also described as another Josiah, who fought the wars of the Lord and whose efforts in reforming and purifying religion and manners in both England and the Dutch Republic were unquestioned.<sup>91</sup> In the Dutch sermons, the secular threat of universal monarchy and the fear of a reinforced Catholicism which would crush the 'Northern Heresy' were considered together. Van Til, for example, considered William as 'the balance of Europe, and the pillar of the Protestant entity'.<sup>92</sup> These two were drawn together, just as the Dutch clergy saw William as the saviour of the nation *and* the Church, and as the preserver of freedom *and* religion. As Haks has recently shown, this confessional discourse was also employed by the secular authorities. 'In the concept of the fatherland that was so often used by the States General,' Haks stated, 'freedom and religion come together.'<sup>93</sup> The preachers, too, believed freedom and the Reformed religion to be the two defining characteristics of both the Dutch and the English nations. In their accounts of both revolutions, it is very hard to separate neatly the religious arguments from the secular. Even legitimations based on constitutional and legalistic thought were often expressed in confessional and providential terms. Van Staveren, for instance, regarded William as the saviour of the English, restoring the 'old Laws, Religion and freedom', who received the crown 'by the voice of God and the people'.<sup>94</sup> 'Had not the Lord done all this,' Costerus rhetorically asked regarding the revolution of 1688/89, 'saving that Nation from Popery . . . restoring its Freedom, preserving its Laws.'<sup>95</sup> The privileges, liberties, laws, and religion of the English and the Dutch were equated with the common good. In the eyes of the Reformed clergymen, to preserve the public interest of both countries was to sustain their religion established by law and their liberties. Thus, ministers preached limited government. Rule could never be sanctioned by referring to Divine Right theories or the will of the sovereign king. James, by polluting pure religion and ruling arbitrarily, had lost God's favour, just as Saul had. William, therefore, fought a righteous war. He was seen as a good ruler because he — not unlike his ancestor William I — was prepared to defend the religion and freedom of two Protestant nations, even at the risk of losing his life. He was also seen as a good ruler because he tried to uphold the liberties and the religion of the English and the Dutch. Providence, good government, and Orange charisma can therefore be regarded as the cornerstones of the sermons in which William's rule was legitimized.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> Petrus van Balen, *Op het erf-stadhouder-ampt den heere prince van Orange, en sijn Hoogheits wettige mammelijke nasaten door de heeren staten van Holland en West-Vriesland opgedragen, een predicatie uit 2 Sam. Cap. Vii. Vers. 25.26. door Petrus van Balen, gedaan in het Hof van haar Hoogheit, Mevrouw de Princesse douaiere, in 's Gravenhage, den VII February, op de gewoone bededag* (The Hague: Jasper Doll, 1674), p. 4.
- <sup>2</sup> Van Balen, *Op het Erf-stadhouder-ampt*, pp. 3, 8, 11.
- <sup>3</sup> Arent Cornelisz., *Tuvee Corte Sermoenen. Het Eene Ouer den Doop des Soons vanden seer Doorluchtighen Prince van Orangien / ende t'Andere op de Begraeffnisse Desseluen Prince* (Delft: Aelbrecht Hendricksz, 1584), p. 21.
- <sup>4</sup> Michel Reinders, 'Burghers, Orangists and "Good Government". Popular Political Opposition during the "Year of Disaster" 1672 in Dutch Pamphlets', *The Seventeenth Century*, 23 (2008), 315–46.
- <sup>5</sup> See also Tony Claydon, *William III* (London: Longman, 2002), pp. 63–68.
- <sup>6</sup> D. J. Roorda, *Partij en factie. De oproeren van 1672 in de steden van Holland en Zeeland, een krachtmeting tussen partijen en facties* (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1978), p. 109; J. I. Israel, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477–1806* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 802.
- <sup>7</sup> See, for example, G. O. van de Klashorst, "Metten schijn van monarchie getempert": De Verdediging van het Stadhouderschap in de Partijliteratuur, 1650–1686', in *Pieter de la Court en Zijn Tijd. Aspecten van een Veezijdig Publicist (1618–1685)*, ed. by H. W. Blom and I. W. Wildenberg (Amsterdam: APA-Holland University Press, 1986), pp. 93–136; G. O. van de Klashorst, 'De ware vrijheid, 1650–1672', in *Vrijheid. Een Geschiedenis van de Vijftiende tot de Twintigste Eeuw*, ed. by E. O. G. Haitsma Mulier and W. R. E. Velema (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1999), pp. 157–85.
- <sup>8</sup> Antonius van Bylert, *Godvertrouwende kerk- en land-weese. Of Eene predicatie over Hosea XIV: 4. gedaan ter gelegenheit van de uitvaert van William de III, koning van Groot Britannien, etc. etc. etc. Gemeine kerk- en land-vader beschermers des geloofs, ende er vryheit van Europa. Hoogloflike en onsterflike gedagtenisse. Door Antonius van Bylert, professor en predikant te Lingen* (Deventer: Albertus Fronten, 1702), p. 42. The translations of the Dutch sources in this article are mine.
- <sup>9</sup> Van Bylert, *Godvertrouwende Kerk- en Land-weese*, pp. 42–43.
- <sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 41–42.
- <sup>11</sup> See also: Pasi Ihalainen, *Protestant Nations Redefined: Changing Perceptions of National Identity in the Rhetoric of the English, Dutch and Swedish Public Churches, 1685–1772* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 216–18; Donald Haks, 'The States General on Religion and War: Manifestos, Policy Documents and Prayer Days in the Dutch Republic', in *War and Religion after Westphalia, 1648–1713*, ed. by David Onnekink (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 155–75.
- <sup>12</sup> Joris van Eijnatten, *Liberty and Concord in the United Provinces: Religious Toleration and the Public in the Eighteenth-Century Netherlands* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), p. 29.
- <sup>13</sup> Johannes Vechovius, *Geheel Nederland in Rouw-bedryf Vertoond over de Dood van Wilhem de Derde* (Tiel: Jan van Leeuwen, 1702), p. 22.
- <sup>14</sup> Van Balen, *Op het Erf-stadhouder-ampt*, p. 8.
- <sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 23–24.
- <sup>16</sup> Florentius Costerus, *Nieuwe Zegen. Ofte een Verhael van Gods Weldaden, Ons in den Jare 1675 Bewesen, Gedaen op den Danck-dag / Gehouden den Vijfden February 1676* (Hoorn: Stoffel Jansz. Kortinh, 1693), p. 164.
- <sup>17</sup> Jacobus de la Faye, *Lyk-predikatie over de dood van den doorlugtigsten vorst Willem de III. Koning van Engeland, Schotland, Vrankrijk, en Yrland. Gedaen op den 30. April 1702 door Jacobus de la Faye, dienaar es Godlijken Woords in de Engelsche gemeente tot Utrecht. Overgezet door Willem Koolenkamp* (Utrecht: Johannes Wagens, 1702), pp. 17–18.
- <sup>18</sup> Albertus van Assendelft, *Lijk-rede, over het overdroevig, en ontijdig afsterven, van Nederlantsch gantsch dierbare en teer beminde vader en Englands waerdste vader en koning te gelijk, Willem de Derde; door Gods genade, en bysondere Voorsienigheyt konink van Engeland, Schotland, Vrankrijk en Yerland, Erf-stadhouder, Admiraal, en Capiteyn Generaal te water en te lande, der Vereenigde Nederlanden, en vry-bevogte Batavieren etc, etc, etc, in den Heere ontslapen den 19 maert A° 1702. Uyt gesproken in de beroemde Heerlijckheit van Schagen, tot Haring-huysen, en aen de Gemeente J. Christi aldaer toegepast uyt Genesis Capittel 49. vers 33. en Capittel 50 vers 1, 2, 3. door Albertus van Assendelft predikant aldaer* (Alkmaar: Gerrit Welhem, 1702), without page numbers.
- <sup>19</sup> Arnold Moonen, *De doot van Josua, op het afsterven van den doorluchtigsten en grootmagtigsten vorst en heere Willem den derden, door Godts genade koning van Groot Britanje, Vrankry en Yrlant, beschermers des geloofs, ontvouwen en toegepast in eene predikaetsie over Jos. xxiv. 2. Uitgesproken den 3. van bloeiemaent 1702. den gedenkdag der verlossing van Overysse, door Arnold Moonen, bedienaer des H. Euangelii te Deventer* (Deventer: Albert Fronten, 1702), p. 211.



- <sup>20</sup> Florentius Costerus, *Nederlands Vloek en Zegen en Deszelfs Re-unie* (Hoorn, 1693), p. 409. Peter Burke has argued that a good deal of the anti-Louis literature was printed in the Dutch Republic. See Peter Burke, *The Fabrication of Louis XIV* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), p. 146.
- <sup>21</sup> David Onnekink, 'The Last War of Religion? The Dutch and the Nine Years War', in *War and Religion*, p. 79.
- <sup>22</sup> Joris van Eijnatten, 'Religionis Causa: Moral Theology and the Concept of Holy War in the Dutch Republic', *Journal of Religious Ethics*, 34 (2006), 609–35.
- <sup>23</sup> Joannes Vollenhove, *Tabitha doot en onsterfelyk: vertoont in een lykpredikaatsie over Hand. IX. 36–39. De doorluchtigste, grootmagtigste vorstinne, Maria de Twede, koninginne door Godts genade van Groot Britanje, Vrankryk en Ierland, beschermster des geloofs, ter gedachtenisse door Joannes Vollenhove, dr. Der H. Theologie en predikant in 's Gravenhage* (The Hague: Gillis van Limburg, 1696), p. 34.
- <sup>24</sup> Tim Harris, *Revolution. The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy 1685–1720* (London: Allen Lane, 2006), 243–247.
- <sup>25</sup> Quoted from Harris, *Revolution*, p. 289.
- <sup>26</sup> Harris, *Revolution*, p. 329.
- <sup>27</sup> Matthijs Wieldraaijer, "De schapen zijn de huid niet schuldig". De Plichten van Onderdanen en Overheden in Zeventiende- en Achttiende-eeuwse Verklaringen van de Heidelbergse Catechismus', *Documentatieblad Nadere Reformatie*, 30 (2006), 97–111.
- <sup>28</sup> Florentius Costerus, *Prins Willem de III. na Engelandt, Vertoont in een Predicatie Gedaen op de Vast- en Bede-dagh Gehouden den Seven-entwintighsten October des Jaars 1688* (Hoorn, 1693), p. 294.
- <sup>29</sup> Costerus, *Prins Willem de III. na Engelandt*, pp. 352, 354, 360–61, 364.
- <sup>30</sup> Johan van Zelst, *De zieltoegende Juda, vertoont in een treur-rede over Klaagl. IV. vers. XX. en toegepast op het droevig afsterven van William III. Koning van Engeland, Schotland, Vrankryk en Yrland, etc. etc. voorgesteld aan de gemeente Jesu Christi tot Ysselsteyn, den 30 april 1702 door Johan van Zelst, predikant aldaar* (Utrecht: Thomas Appels, 1702), p. 29.
- <sup>31</sup> Johannes Spitsius, *Zions- treurgalm over den ontijdigen, doch saligen doot der doorluchtigste en grootmachtichste vorstinne Maria Stuart door des Alderhoosten Genade koningin van Engeland, Schotland, Vrankryk en Yerland. Hoogloffelijker gedagtenisse voorgedragen in een predicatie uit de klaagliederen Jerem. 5. v. 16. Die kroon is van ons hoofd gevallen, ô wee ons dat wy soo gezondigt hebben. Op den 20 febr: in de kerk toegedaan de Augsburgse belijdenis in den Haag. Door Johannes Spitzius, leeraar van deselve* (Den Haag: Engelbrecht Bouquet, 1695), p. 8.
- <sup>32</sup> Johannes Wilhelmius, *Algemene kerke en lants droefheyd, over 't allerontydigst afsterven van William de III. koning van Groot Brittannien, erf-stadhouder der Vereenigde Nederland, Grave van Lingen, etc. etc. uytgedrukt in een lykreden, op publyke last van de hoge overheyd door Johannes Wilhelmius, professor in de H. Theologie en kerkelyke geschriften, en predikant tot Lingen* (Amsterdam: Isaak Stokmans, 1702), p. 25.
- <sup>33</sup> Lukas van Eybergen, *De Dogter Zions in Diepen Rouw, over 't Verlies van Haaren Koning* (Leiden: Hendrik van Damme, 1702), p. 21.
- <sup>34</sup> Frederik van Hermkhuysen, *Israel ter uitvaart met Mirjam, of Lykreden over num: 20:1. in 't einde. By gelegenheid van de begravenise der allerdoorluchtigste, groot-magtigste vorstinne Maria Stuart, door de genade des Allerhoogste, koninginne van Engeland, Schotland, Vrankryk en Ierland, etc. etc. beschermer des geloofs uitgesproken tot Asch in 't grauschap Buuren, den 10 maart des jaars 1695. St: Jul. Door Frederik van Hermkhuysen* (Amsterdam: Gerard Borstius, 1695), p. 24.
- <sup>35</sup> Joannes Vollenhove, *Een Groot Vorst, Ons Israel Ontvallen door de Doot van den Doorluchtigsten, Grootmagtigsten Vorst, Willem den Derden* (The Hague: Gillis van Limburg, 1705), p. 21.
- <sup>36</sup> Johannes van Staveren, *'T ontluytst Neerland. Door de onverwagte dood van den grootsten landgenoot, erff-stadhouder, en allgemeynen veld-heer, der vrije Batavieren William de IIIde koning van Groot-Brittannien, Vrankrijk en Yerland beschermer des geloofs. In een lijk-reden aan de gemeynte van Alkmaar over Klaag-liederen V. vers 16 op den xxvi maart anno 1702. vertegenwoordigt door Johannes van Staveren* (Leiden: Frederik Haaring, 1702), p. 31.
- <sup>37</sup> Wilhelmus Velingius, *Nederlands Dank- en Vierdags-taal. Wegens de Verheffinge tot, en Huldiging in de Koninglyke Waardigheid over Engeland, Vrankryk en Yrland van Hare Majesteiten Willem III en Maria II, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn* (Rotterdam: Hermanus Kentlink, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, 1747), pp. 25, 27.
- <sup>38</sup> Daniel le Roy, *De vervloekte Konings-Moord, Listelyk voorgenomen, wonderlyk ontdekt, gelukkiglyk verydelt, rechtveerdiglyk gestraft en billijklyk aangeteikend. Verdoond uyt Ahasveros Voorbeeld, en toegepast op de Door-luchtigste, Hoog-geboorne, en Groot-magtigste Vorst, Willem de Derde In een Predicatie gedaen op den laast-leden Al-gemeenen Dank en Bede-dag, zijnde den 1/11 april 1696* (Amsterdam: weduwe S. Swart, 1696), p. 33.
- <sup>39</sup> Van Eybergen, *De Dogter Zions*, p. 22.
- <sup>40</sup> Dominicus Goltzius, *Geen Heyl in het Vertrouwen op Sterflyke Prinsen, maer op den God Jacobs, Zijnde een Predicatie uyt Psalm 146 vers 3, 4, 5, gedaen tot Hindeloopen* (Amsterdam: Jacobus van Hardenberg, 1702), pp. 10, 11.
- <sup>41</sup> Van Bylert, *Godvertrouwende Kerk- en Land-weese*, pp. 43–44.

- <sup>42</sup> Wilhelmius, *Algemene Kerke en Lants Droefheyd*, p. 32.
- <sup>43</sup> See, for example, Lois G. Schworer, 'Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688–1689', *The American Historical Review*, 82 (1977), 843–74; Jonathan I. Israel, 'Propaganda in the Making of the Glorious Revolution', in *Across the Narrow Seas: Studies in the History and Bibliography of Britain and the Low Countries*, ed. by Susan Roach (London: British Library, 1991), pp. 167–77; A. Th. van Deursen, 'Propaganda: The Battle for Public Opinion', in *Science and Culture under William and Mary*, ed. by John David North and Peter Wolfgang Klein (Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie voor Wetenschappen, 1992), pp. 55–67.
- <sup>44</sup> Le Roy, *De vervloekte Konings-Moord*, pp. 25, 33.
- <sup>45</sup> Cornelius Bosch, *Het Heyl der Koningen, Vertoont in een Predicatie over Psalm 144, vs. 9, 10, 11: Uytgesproocken in de Klooster-kerck binnen 's-Gravenhage inde Tegenwoordigheyt van Syn Doorluchtigste Majesteit Willem III* (Amsterdam: Laurens Gunter, 1691), p. 4.
- <sup>46</sup> Alardus Tiele, *De Dood en Begravinge van den Godvruchtigen Koning David, Afgebeeld in al Zijn Omstandigheden, en Nader Overgebracht op de Persoon van de Overdierbare Majesteit Willem de Derde* (Rotterdam: Reinier van Doesburg, 1702), p. 17.
- <sup>47</sup> H. W. Blom, "'Our Prince is King!": The Impact of the Glorious Revolution on Political Debate in the Dutch Republic', *Parliaments, Estates and Representation*, 10 (1990), 45–58 (pp. 46–49).
- <sup>48</sup> Martin van Gelderen, *The Political Thought of the Dutch Revolt 1555–1590* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), *passim*.
- <sup>49</sup> *Placcaet van Verlatinghe* (Leiden: Charles Silvius, 1581). See also Van Gelderen, *The Political Thought*, pp. 149–51.
- <sup>50</sup> Israel, 'Propaganda', pp. 173.
- <sup>51</sup> Le Roy, *De Vervloekte Konings-Moord*, pp. 33–34.
- <sup>52</sup> Velingius, *Nederlands Dank- en Vier-dags-taal*, p. 56.
- <sup>53</sup> Theodorus Ubink, *Zalige Nagedagtenis, van Davids Leven en Sterven, Toe-gepast op het Zalige, dog Ontijdige Afsterven van de Doorlugtigste der Vorsten Willem de III* (Utrecht: Willem van Poolsum, 1702), p. 26.
- <sup>54</sup> For example Van Eybergen, *De Dogter Zions*, p. 22.
- <sup>55</sup> Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 4.
- <sup>56</sup> Steven Pincus, "'To protect English liberties": The English Nationalist Revolution of 1688–1689', in *Protestantism and National Identity. Britain and Ireland, c. 1650–1850*, ed. by Tony Claydon and Ian McBride (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 75–104.
- <sup>57</sup> Tony Claydon, 'Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom in William's War Propaganda, 1689–1697', in *Redefining William III: The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context*, ed. by Esther Mijers and D. M. L. Onnekink (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), p. 130.
- <sup>58</sup> Steve Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009), pp. 452–53.
- <sup>59</sup> Pincus, *The First Modern Revolution*, pp. 92–94, 115–16, 197–98, 210–11, 437–73.
- <sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 6–7, 49–90, 471–73.
- <sup>61</sup> Van Eijnatten, *Liberty and Concord*, p. 3. See also chapters 2–3.
- <sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, chapters 4 and 7.
- <sup>63</sup> Edwina Hagen, *Een Meer of Min Doodlyken Haat. Antipapisme en Cultureel Natiebesef rond 1800* (Nijmegen: Vantilt, 2008), *passim*.
- <sup>64</sup> Van Eijnatten, *Liberty and Concord*, pp. 191–99.
- <sup>65</sup> Caspar Fagel, *A Letter, Writ by Mijn Heer Fagel, Pensioner of Holland, to Mr James Stewart, Advocate: Giving an Account of the Prince and Princess of Orange's Thoughts Concerning the Repeal of the Test, and the Penal Laws* (London, 1688). Interpreters of English law argued similarly. See Tim Harris, 'The People, the Law, and the Constitution in Scotland and England', *Journal of British Studies*, 38 (1999), p. 42.
- <sup>66</sup> Vechovius, *Geheel Nederland*, p. 8.
- <sup>67</sup> Ubink, *Zalige Nagedagtenis*, p. 30.
- <sup>68</sup> William's toleration policy was often seen as evidence that William was a politician who did not follow confessional maxims. For example: J. I. Israel, 'William III and Toleration' in *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England*, ed. by Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan Irvine Israel and Nicholas R. N. Tyacke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), pp. 129–70; Frits Broeyer, 'William III and the Reformed Church of the Netherlands', in *Redefining William III*, pp. 109–23. However, as shown above, even Reformed clergymen were in favour of some sort of toleration in that they respected freedom of conscience and abhorred religious persecution and coercion. Religious toleration and confessional politics were not regarded as incompatible with each other.
- <sup>69</sup> See also Emma Bergin, 'Defending the True Faith: Religious Themes in Dutch Pamphlets on England, 1688–1689', in *War and Religion after Westphalia*, pp. 217–50.
- <sup>70</sup> Matthijs Wieldraaijer, 'De Sensibele Stadhouder en de Gedisciplineerde Gouvernante. Beelden van Willem IV en Anna van Hannover in Preken', *De Achttiende Eeuw*, 41 (2009), 192–217.
- <sup>71</sup> Quoted from: N. Japikse, *Prins Willem III, de Stadhouder-koning* (Amsterdam: Meulenhoff 1930), vol. 1, pp. 59–60.

- <sup>72</sup> G. D. J. Schotel, 'Cornelis Trigland, Leermeester van Willem III', *Godgeleerde Bijdragen*, 39 (1865), 186: 'Cum inexpectatus saepe cubiculum intraret, aliquoties vidit, invenit Triglandius eum orantem de geniculis, et orantem in haec ipsa verba: ut Nutritius Ecclesiae, columna religionis, suo posset tempore inveniri.'
- <sup>73</sup> For Trigland's advisory tract see: Matthijs Wieldraaijer, 'Onderwijs aan het Oranjehof in de Zeventiende Eeuw', *Historisch Tijdschrift Holland*, 41 (2009), 87–94.
- <sup>74</sup> Cornelis Trigland, *Idea, Sive Imago Principis Christiani* (The Hague: Pieter Tongerloo, 1666), dedicatio.
- <sup>75</sup> Schotel, 'Cornelius Trigland', p. 188.
- <sup>76</sup> Wieldraaijer, 'Onderwijs', pp. 92–94.
- <sup>77</sup> G. Scutter, *De macht van Godt geordineert, voorgesteld aan de gemeente van Buren, in eene leerrede over Romeinen XIII, vers, ter oorzaake van de eerste intrede Zyner Hoogheit Prins Willem de III. binnen zyn graafschap van Buren, op den 13 July 1657, thans by de geboorte van den jongen Willem weder in 't ligt gebracht* (Leiden: K. de Pekker, 1748), pp. 19–21.
- <sup>78</sup> Salomon van Til, *Zielen-raad in Tyden van Druk aan 't Bedroefde Nederland, ter Occasie van het Smertelijk Overlijden van William de III* (Dordrecht: Joannes van Braam, 1702), pp. 32–33.
- <sup>79</sup> Theodorus van Toll, *Neerlands danktaar met het opschrift De Heere is mijn baniere, ofte Dankpredikaatsie gepast op de overwinninge van de stad en het kasteel van Namen, verkregen door de wapenen der geallieerden, onder het beleyd van Willem de III.* (Utrecht: Anthoni Schouten, 1695), p. 24.
- <sup>80</sup> Johannes Doesburg, *De rouwe van gansch Juda over de dood van den godvruchtigen koning Josia, toegepast en naader uitgebreid op het overdroevig afsterven van zijn majesteid Willem de Derde koning van Engeland, Schotland, Vrankryk en Yerland, Erfstadhouder, etc. etc. et. ende tot opwekkinge van het Nederlands Juda, in deze tijden voorgesteld uit II Chron. xxxv vers 23, 24, 25. door Johannes Doesburg bedienaar des H. Evangeliums tot Rotterdam* (Rotterdam: Reynier van Doesburg, 1702), p. 51.
- <sup>81</sup> Moonen, *De Doot van Josua*, pp. 21–22.
- <sup>82</sup> De la Faye, *Lyk-predikatie*, pp. 19–20.
- <sup>83</sup> Vechovius, *Geheel Nederland*, p. 28.
- <sup>84</sup> Jacob Artopé, *De Koninklijke waerdicheit, gebracht onder, maer triumpheerende over, den konink der verschrickinge. Gepast op de droeve, toch zaelige, dood, van de groot-machtigste en doorlugtigste Maria door Gods genade coningin van Engeland, Schotland, Vrancryk en Yerland, Beschermster des geloofs etc. etc. In een lyk-rede gedaan binnen Breda, den xxx. Januari, M.CD.XCV. over de woorden, psalm, LXXXII v. 6,7, door Jacob Artope* (Breda: Cornelis Seldenslach, 1695), p. 26.
- <sup>85</sup> Goltzius, *Geen Heyl*, p. 11.
- <sup>86</sup> Moonen, *De Doot van Josua*, p. 23.
- <sup>87</sup> Ubink, *Zalige Nagedagtenis*, p. 26.
- <sup>88</sup> J. de Witt, *Deductie, ofte Declaratie van de Staten van Hollandt ende West-Vrieslandt: Behelsende een Waerachtich ende Grondich Bericht van de Fondamenten der Regieringe vande Vrye Vereenichde Nederlanden ... Ingesteld ende Dienende tot Justificatie van 't Verleenen van Seeckere Akte van Seclusie, Raeckende 't Employ vanden Heere Prince van Oraigne* (The Hague: Hillebrant Jacobsz van Wouw, 1654), pp. 1, 74.
- <sup>89</sup> Olaf Mörke, 'The Content, Form and Function of Swiss and Dutch Images of History', in *The Republican Alternative: The Netherlands and Switzerland Compared*, ed. by André Holenstein (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2008), p. 180.
- <sup>90</sup> Wilhelmius, *Algemene Kerke en Lants Droefheyd*, p. 31.
- <sup>91</sup> For example: Doesburg, *De Rouwe van Gansch Juda*, pp. 57–63. For William as Josiah see also Claydon, *The Godly Revolution*, pp. 38, 107–08.
- <sup>92</sup> Van Til, *Zielen-raad*, p. 24.
- <sup>93</sup> Haks, 'The States General on Religion and War', p. 174.
- <sup>94</sup> Van Staveren, 'T Ontluysterd Neerland', p. 31.
- <sup>95</sup> Costerus, *Nederlands Vloek en Zegen*, p. 401.

## Notes on contributor

Matthijs Wieldraaijer is a PhD candidate at VU University Amsterdam. He researches representations of members of the House of Orange in Dutch sermons in the period 1650–1840. His research focuses especially on the role religion, gender, and the 'art of government' played in the constructions of representations of the Oranges.

Correspondence to Faculty of Arts, VU University Amsterdam, De Boelelaan 1105, NL-1081 HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Email: mh.wieldraaijer@let.vu.nl.